13

14

15

16

17

18

19 v.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	J. Stephen Peek, Esq.
	Nevada Bar No. 1758
2	Michael W. Wadley, Esq.
	Nevada Bar No. 12119
3	HOLLAND & HART LLP
	9555 Hillwood Drive, 2nd Floor
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89134
	702-669-4600
5	702-669-4650 – fax
	speek@hollandhart.com
6	mwwadley@hollandhart.com
7	Brett L. Foster, Esq. (pro hac admission)
	Mark A. Miller, Esq. (pro hac admission)
8	Richard T. Jackson, Esq. (pro hac admission)
	HOLLAND & HART LLP
9	222 S. Main Street, Suite 2200
	Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
10	801-799-5800
	801-799-5700 – fax
11	<u>bfoster@hollandhart.com</u>
	mamiller@hollandhart.com
12	

James A. Kohl, Esq. Howard & Howard 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1400 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 702-257-1483 702-567-1568 - faxjkohl@howardandhoward.com

Thomas I. Rozsa, Esq. (pro hac admission) Rozsa Law Group, LC 18757 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 220 Tarzana, California 91356 818-783-0990 tom@rozsalaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Jag Precision, Inc.

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CYBERGUN S.A., a French Corporation, and FN HERSTAL, S.A., a Belgian Corporation,
Plaintiffs,

CASE NO. 2:12-cv-00074-KJD-GWF

JAG PRECISION, INC., a California Corporation,

THIRD JOINT STATUS REPORT

Defendant.

Pursuant to the Local Rules and the Court's Scheduling Order, Plaintiffs Cybergun S.A. and FN Herstal, S.A. (collectively "Plaintiffs") and Defendant Jag Precision ("Defendant") by and through their respective counsel, present the Court with the following status report given that the current discovery cutoff is set for May 31, 2013 and the Court requires a joint status report on the state of discovery sixty days prior to the discovery cutoff.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

///

Plaintiffs commenced this action on January 17, 2012. After entering a Temporary Restraining Order, the Court later entered a Preliminary Injunction against Defendant in connection with Plaintiffs' SCAR rifle design (Dkt. 26). Thereafter, on October 29, 2012, the Court entered a Preliminary Injunction against Defendant in connection with Plaintiffs' M249 and P90 gun designs (Dkt. 64). Defendant has appealed this decision and order, and that appeal is running concurrent with this case.

The parties continue to engage in settlement dialogue. Both parties continue to believe that there is a reasonable chance that part or all of the case could be resolved via settlement.

Plaintiffs have served written discovery and have received initial responses. Plaintiffs have communicated deficiencies in Defendant's initial discovery responses and have also served additional discovery on Defendant. On December 28, 2012, Defendant issued written discovery and Plaintiffs have provided responses. The parties will conduct depositions and have begun scheduling depositions to take place in May 2013.

Plaintiffs expect to file substantive motions on liability issues in the case, including the counterclaims filed by Defendant. Defendant expects to file dispositive motions as well. The parties expect that the scope of issues to be resolved at trial, if the case does not settle, will be reduced by these forthcoming dispositive motions.

The parties estimate that seven (7) trial days will be required to try this case, as presently pleaded. The time required to try this case, of course, will be reduced if some of the issues are resolved via summary judgment proceedings. Plaintiff estimates that a trial on the subject of trade dress infringement, and damages would require three to four days.

The pretrial order in this case is due on October 22, 2013. The parties propose the following three (3) dates for trial: October 28, 2013; November 11, 2013; and November 18, 2013.

///

///

27 ///

28 ///

Case 2:12-cv-00074-APG-GWF Document 71 Filed 04/01/13 Page 3 of 3

Page 3 of 3

28